

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/739,884	12/18/2003	Walter Belchine III	14429	9706
75	90 12/20/2004		EXAMINER	
PAUL F. DONOVAN ILLINOIS TOOL WORKS, INC. 3600 WEST LAKE AVENUE			LUGO, CARLOS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GLENVIEW, I	L 60025		3676	
			DATE MAILED: 12/20/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. /		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan.		10/739,884	BELCHINE ET AL.			
()	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Carlos Lugo	3676			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Re	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 18 L	December 2003.				
2a) Th	is action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.				
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition	of Claims					
4)⊠ CI 4a) 5)⊡ CI 6)⊠ CI 7)⊡ CI	4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
Application	Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 December 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct e oath or declaration is objected to by the E		·			
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of 2) Notice of 3) Informati	References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) b(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/739,884 Page 2

Art Unit: 3676

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,167,779 to Sano et al (Sano).

Regarding claim 1, Sano discloses a door handle assembly comprising a housing (1) that includes a first outer wall, a second outer wall (over 5b, Figure 4), and a partition wall (5a) between said first and second outer walls. The partition wall defines a projection (6) extending toward the second outer wall.

The door handle assembly further comprises a latch handle (2) and a lock lever (15). The latch handle defines a latch handle aperture receiving the partitioned wall projection therein.

However, Sano fails to disclose that the latch handle and the lock lever defines projections that will be received in apertures at the first and second outer walls and that the lock lever defines a lock lever aperture receiving the projection of the partition wall.

As to the latch handle and the lock lever defining projections received in apertures at the first and second outer walls, Sano discloses that the latch handle

and the lock lever defines apertures that will receive projections defined at the first and second outer walls.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the projections defined at the latch handle and the lock lever, and have the apertures at the first and second outer walls, instead of the opposite, because that limitation will be considered as a design consideration within the skill of the art that will not affect the engagement of mechanism of the assembly.

As to the fact that Sano fails to disclose that the lock lever defines a lock lever aperture receiving the projection of the partition wall, Sano discloses that the lock lever (15) defines a lock lever aperture, but to receive another projection of the partition wall. Also, Sano discloses that the latch handle and the lock lever are connected or supported to the partition wall.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the lock lever aperture receiving the projection that is received in the latch handle aperture, in order to have an assembly wherein the partition wall can be created with less material and at the same time create a partition wall that is functional and adjustable to support both members, the latch handle and the lock lever at the same point.

As to claim 2, Sano discloses that the apertures and the projections are in substantially axial alignment.

As to claim 3, Sano illustrates that the latch handle have an extension spanning the partition wall (Figure 4).

As to claim 20, Sano discloses a method for assembling a vehicle door handle assembly.

 Claims 1,2 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,895,081 to Tanimoto et al (Tanimoto '081).

Regarding claim 1, Tanimoto '081 discloses a door handle assembly comprising a housing (2) that includes a first outer wall, a second outer wall (21 and 23), and a partition wall (22) between said first and second outer walls. The partition wall defines a projection (22a) extending toward the second outer wall.

The door handle assembly further comprises a latch handle (3) and a lock lever (4). The latch handle defines a latch handle aperture (312a) receiving a partitioned wall projection therein.

However, Tanimoto '081 fails to disclose that the latch handle and the lock lever defines projections that will be received in apertures at the first and second outer walls and that the lock lever defines a lock lever aperture receiving the projection of the partition wall.

As to the latch handle and the lock lever defining projections received in apertures at the first and second outer walls, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the latch handle and the lock lever defines apertures that will receive projections defined at the first and second outer walls.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the projections defined at the latch handle and the lock lever, and have the apertures at the first and second outer walls, instead of the

opposite, because that limitation will be considered as a design consideration within

the skill of the art that will not affect the engagement of mechanism of the assembly.

As to the fact that Tanimoto '081 fails to disclose that the lock lever defines a lock lever aperture receiving the projection of the partition wall, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the lock lever (4) defines a lock lever aperture, but to receive another projection (22b) of the partition wall. Tanimoto '081 also discloses that the latch handle and the lock lever are connected or supported to the partition wall.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the lock lever aperture receiving the projection that is received in the latch handle aperture, in order to have an assembly wherein the partition wall can be created with less material and at the same time create a partition wall that is functional and adjustable to support both members, the latch handle and the lock lever at the same point.

As to claim 2, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the apertures and the projections are in substantially axial alignment.

As to claim 20, Tanimoto '081 discloses a method for assembling a vehicle door handle assembly.

4. Claims 3-5,7 and 9, as applied to claim 1, and 11,12,14-16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,895,081 to Tanimoto et al (Tanimoto '081) in view of US Pat No 6,167,779 to Sano et al (Sano).

Regarding claim 3, Tanimoto '081 fails to disclose that the latch handle have an extension spanning the partition wall.

Sano illustrates that the latch handle have an extension spanning the partition wall (Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a latch handle with an extension spanning the partition wall, as taught by Sano, into a device as described by Tanimoto '081, in order to support the latch handle to the partition wall.

As to claims 4 and 11, Tanimoto '081 illustrates that the lock lever is disposed in a chamber defined between the partition wall and the second outer wall. The latch handle has a panel extending into the chamber. The lock lever is disposed between the panel and the second outer wall (Figure 3).

As to claims 5,9 and 16, Tanimoto '081 fails to that the lock lever defines a ramplike surface adjacent the lock lever aperture.

Sano teaches that is well known in the art to have a lock lever (15) defining a ramp surface adjacent the lock lever aperture (Figures 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have ramp surfaces at the lock lever, as taught by Sano, into a device as described by Tanimoto '081, in order to provide means for an easy assembly of the device.

As to claims 7 and 18, Tanimoto '081 fails to disclose that the projection of the lock lever defines a ramp-like surface.

Sano teaches that it is well known in the art to have a projection defining a ramplike surface (where the lock lever is inserted, Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have ramp surfaces at a projection, as taught by Sano, into a device as described by Tanimoto '081, in order to provide means for an easy assembly of the device.

As to claim 12, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the assembly further comprises a spring (6) biasing the latch handle.

As to claim 14, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the assembly includes a latch cable) extending into the first chamber and connected to the latch handle.

As to claim 15, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the assembly includes a lock cable extending into the second chamber and connected to the lock lever.

As to claim 19, Tanimoto '081 discloses that the apertures have enclosed sides.

5. Claims 6,8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,895,081 to Tanimoto et al (Tanimoto '081) in view of US Pat No 6,167,779 to Sano et al (Sano), as applied to claims 4 and 7, and further in view of US Pat No 5,794,994 to Miyagawa et al (Miyagawa).

Tanimoto '081, as modified by Sano, fails to disclose that the outer wall defines a ramp-like surface angling inwardly in the chamber.

Miyagawa teaches that it is well known in the art to have an outer wall (13) that defines a ramp-like surface angling inwardly in the chamber (Figure 3).

Art Unit: 3676

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have ramp surfaces at the outer wall member, as taught by Miyagawa, into a device as described by Tanimoto '081, as modified by Sano, in order to provide means for an easy assembly of the device.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,895,081 to Tanimoto et al (Tanimoto '081) in view of US Pat No 6,167,779 to Sano et al (Sano), as applied to claim 11, and further in view of US Pat No 5,129,694 to Tanimoto et al (Tanimoto '694).

Tanimoto '081, as modified by Sano, fails to disclose that the assembly further includes a resilient bumper.

Tanimoto '694 teaches that it is well known in the art to have a door handle assembly that includes a resilient bumper (102).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a resilient bumper, as taught by Tanimoto '694, into a device as described by Tanimoto '081, as modified by Sano, in order to protect the handle form damage when the handle is operated.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 703-305-9747. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 703-308-2686. The fax phone Application/Control Number: 10/739,884

Art Unit: 3676

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5771.

C.C.

Carlos Lugo AU 3676

December 8, 2004.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**

Page 9

for D. Stodola